

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
12/29/2003	Ramses Nashed	2854	
08/04/2005		EXAMINER	
EDWARD P. DUTKIEWICZ, ESQ. EDWARD P. DUTKEIWICZ, P.A. 640 DOUGLAS AVENUE		RAGONESE, ANDREA M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4698-7001		3743	
	12/29/2003 08/04/2005 TKIEWICZ, ESQ. KEIWICZ, P.A. VENUE	12/29/2003 Ramses Nashed 08/04/2005 TKIEWICZ, ESQ. KEIWICZ, P.A. VENUE	12/29/2003 Ramses Nashed 08/04/2005 EXAM TKIEWICZ, ESQ. KEIWICZ, P.A. VENUE ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

$\leq \Delta P$	•
M	

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/747,638	NASHED, RAMSES		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Andrea M. Ragonese	3743		

Advisory Action	10/747,638	NASHEU, KANISES			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Andrea M. Ragonese	3743			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addi	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 11 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. 					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> (See 37 CFR 1.1		gected claims.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).	• •	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).					
 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by 		•	1		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s).			
	Sur	Herry Bennett Print Patent Exar Group 3700	niner		

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

Applicant's remarks have been carefully considered, however, they are not persuasive. Consequentially, Applicant's After Final Amendment will not be entered because new considerations of claimed elements recited in the independent claim (claim 2) were not previously considered. These new issues require further search and consideration.

Regarding claim 2, the amended claim now recites "an ambient-to-inside-the-mask inflow flapper valve," which was not previously recited in combination nor was a thorough search conducted by the Examiner to specifically find this combination. In addition, this amendment would require that a 35 USC §112, 1st paragraph, rejection be made for lack of written description for this newly claimed element. The specification as originally filed does not offer proper support for this new claim limitation.

Applicant has not claimed in independent claim 2, an apparatus that is distinguishable over the prior art of record. Therefore, as broadly and reasonably interpreted by the Examiner, the previously presented Final Rejection, dated June 2, 2005, is deemed proper and still stands. However, Applicant is reminded that claims 1 and 6 contain allowable subject matter, as previously presented in the last Office action.

Henry

Froup 3700